REMARKS

Claims 1-32 have been examined. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 16-18, 24, 25 and 28-31 have

been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20-23, 26, 27 and

32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

I.   Preliminary Matters

The Examiner has objected to the figures because they include reference numerals not

mentioned in the specification. In particular, the Examiner has objected to Fig. 2 since reference

numeral 21 is not disclosed in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the

specification to change reference numeral "11" to "21" in order to correct the error.

Applicant has also made a correction to Fig. 2 to change the reference numeral of the

auxiliary storage of host computer 29, from "27A" to "29A." A copy of the corrected formal

drawing is being submitted with the Office Action.

The Examiner has further objected to Fig. 2 since job data 37 is referred to as job data 33

on page 5 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the specification, and

submits that such amendments overcome the drawing objection.

The Examiner has objected to the title as not being descriptive of the invention to which

the claims are directed. Accordingly, Applicant has rewritten the title, and submits that the title

should not be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

The Examiner has further objected to the specification due to minor informalities. Due to

the amendments made to the specification, in view of the drawing objections, Applicant submits

that the objections to the specification are overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

II.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,184,996 to Gase ("Gase").

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 16-18, 24, 25 and 28-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Gase.

As an initial matter, Applicant would like to point out to the Examiner that the Examiner's

comments concerning the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999, on page 3 of the Office

Action, are not appropriate in view of the changes made in MPEP 2136 (2002). Nevertheless,

Applicant submits that the Examiner's comments do not impact the substance of the Office

Action.

A.   Claim 1

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim

1 recites that the host computer contains a storage unit for storing job data of a print job.

Applicant submits that Gase does not teach or disclose any storage unit in client processor 12,

which is used for storing job data of a print job (Fig. 1).

Claim 1 further recites that the host computer can generate the job data of a print job at a

time which is later than a time of receipt of the print job.

Applicant submits that Gase fails to teach or disclose such a feature. For example, Gase

discloses that a client processor (i.e. processor 12) may have a print job <u>ready</u> for submission to

printer 14 (col. 3, lines 4-6). However, Gase does not disclose that a client processor ever

generates job data of a print job <u>at a time which is later than</u> a time of receipt of the print job.

Further, Gase appears to be directed more towards obtaining a print job designated by a URL

from the World Wide Web via browser 26 of printer 14 (col. 3, lines 16-18). Accordingly,

Applicant submits that Gase fails to teach or disclose the above features.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited

reference.

B.   Claim 3

Since claim 3 is dependent upon claim 1, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable

at least by virtue of its dependency.

C.   Claim 6

Since claim 6 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 1,

Applicant submits that such claim is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

D.   Claim 8

Since claim 8 is dependent upon claim 6, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable

at least by virtue of its dependency.

E. Claim 11

Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited reference. For example,

claim 11 recites that a printer processes a print job according to a condition of a print engine and

a receive buffer memory.

Applicant submits that Gase fails to teach or disclose such features. For example,

although Gase discloses the use of a queue in printer 14, the queue just lists received URL's (col.

3, lines 24-25). The printer 14 must then request client processor 12 for a specific print job (i.e.

text of URL) to print from the queue (col. 3, lines 25-28). Once the printer receives the text of

the print job, it prints the text (col. 3, lines 28-30). Also, it appears that the client processor 12

can rearrange the queue order of the URL's (col. 3, lines 33-36). Therefore, Applicant submits

that the print jobs of Gase appear to be processed based on instructions from the client processor

12, rather than according to a schedule of a print engine and receive buffer memory of the printer

itself, as required by claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited reference.

F. Claims 12 and 13

Since claims 12 and 13 are dependent upon claim 11, Applicant submits that such claims

are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

G.   Claim 16

Since claim 16 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 11,

Applicant submits that claim 16 is patentable over the cited reference for at least analogous

reasons as presented above.

H.   Claims 17 and 18

Since claims 17 and 18 are dependent upon claim 16, Applicant submits that such claims

are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

I.   Claim 24

Since claim 24 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 1,

Applicant submits that such claim is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

J.   Claim 25

Since claim 25 is dependent upon claim 24, Applicant submits that such claim is

patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

K.   Claim 28

Since claim 28 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 1,

Applicant submits that claim 28 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

L.   Claim 29

Since claim 29 is dependent upon claim 28, Applicant submits that such claim is

patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

M.   Claim 30

Since claim 30 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 1,

Applicant submits that claim 30 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

N.   Claim 31

Since claim 31 is dependent upon claim 30, Applicant submits that such claim is

patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

III.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,728 to Debry ("Debry").

Claims 2 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over Gase as applied to claims 1, and 6 above and further in view of Debry.

A.   Claim 2

Applicant submits that claim 2 is patentable over the cited references. For example,

claim 2 recites that a host computer sends job location data showing a location of job data to a

print server. The print server temporarily stores the job location data and sends it to the printer.

The printer then sends the job request, which the job location data shows, to the host computer.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gase does not teach that a host computer sends job location data to a print server, but contends that Debry does. However, Applicant believes the Examiner is misintepreting and/or misapplying the cited reference. For example, in Debry, when a user sends a request to print a document to document source 10, the document source 10 creates a will-call certificate 40 (Fig. 1; col. 7, lines 15-19). The will-call certificate 40 may include a name of the document source 10, which will tell print server 30 exactly where to go to get the document (col. 7, lines 20-23). The will-call certificate 40 is then sent to the user 20 (col. 7, lines 17-19).

The user 20 takes the will-call certificate 40 and builds a print request (col. 7, lines 43-45). The user 20 sends the print request to the print server 30 (Fig. 1, lines 43-45). Print server 30 receives the request and then goes to document source 10 to request the document (col. 7, lines 50-51). In particular, print server 30 gives the will-call certificate 40 to document source 10 to verify that the printer is allowed to get that document (col. 7, lines 51-53). After verification, document source 10 sends the requested document to the printer (col. 8, lines 32-36).

The Examiner maintains that document source 10 discloses the claimed host computer, and user 20 discloses the claimed server. However, as described above, and shown in Fig. 1 of Debry, user 20 does not function as a printer server. Also, although printer server 30 may include a computer that performs other tasks besides management of printer functions, the user 20 and printer 30 are clearly different features, as disclosed in col. 6, line 53 to col. 7, line 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Debry fails to teach or disclose that a host computer

10 (document source) sends job location data (will-call certificate) to printer server 30. Rather,

as shown in Fig. 1 of Debry, and described above, the will-call certificate is solely sent to user 20

upon request. Since user 20 fails to teach or disclose the claimed print server, Applicant submits

that Debry fails to cure the deficient teachings of Gase. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 2 is

patentable over the combination of the cited references.

B.   Claim 7

Since claim 7 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 2,

Applicant submits that claim 7 is patentable for at least similar reasons as presented above.

IV.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of Pipeline Corporation.

Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 26, 27 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gase as applied to claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 24 and 30

above and further in view of Pipeline Corporation ("Pipeline") (column 1, lines 48-60, Gase).

A.   Claims 4 and 5

Since claims 4 and 5 are dependent upon claim 1, and Pipeline fails to cure the deficient

teachings of Gase, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their

dependency.

B.   Claims 9 and 10

Since claims 9 and 10 are dependent upon claim 6, and Pipeline fails to cure the deficient

teachings of Gase, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their

dependency.

C.   Claims 14 and 15

Since claims 14 and 15 are dependent upon claim 11, and Pipeline fails to cure the

deficient teachings of Gase, as discussed in detail below, Applicant submits that such claims are

patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

D.   Claims 19 and 20

Since claims 19 and 20 are dependent upon claim 16, and Pipeline fails to cure the

deficient teachings of Gase, as discussed in detail below, Applicant submits that such claims are

patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

E.   Claims 26 and 27

Since claims 26 and 27 are dependent upon claim 24, and Pipeline fails to cure the

deficient teachings of Gase, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue

of their dependency.

F.   Claim 32

Since claim 32 is dependent upon claim 30, and Pipeline fails to cure the deficient teachings of Gase, Applicant submits that such claim is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

V.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of Debry

Claims 21-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase in view of Debry

A.   Claim 21

Since claim 21 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 2, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable over the cited references for at least analogous reasons as presented in claim 2. In particular, Applicant submits that user 20 of Debry fails to teach or disclose the claimed print server (Fig. 1). Also, as stated in Applicants comments for claim 2, the print server 30 taught in Debry does not receive any job location data from document source 10.

Accordingly, since Debry fails to cure the deficient teachings of Gase, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable over the cited references.

B.   Claims 22 and 23

Since claims 22 and 23 contain features which are analogous to the features of claim 21, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above.

VI.   Newly added claims

Applicant has added claims 33-36 to provide more varied protection for the present

invention.

VII.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 10, 2003

Allison M. Bowles
Registration No. 48,294

28